

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

JEREMY J. QUINN,	)	CASE NO. 4:14 CV 1972
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS
	)	
v.	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
J. PAY, et al.,	)	<u>AND ORDER</u>
	)	
Defendants.	)	

On September 5, 2014, Plaintiff *pro se* Jeremy J. Quinn, an inmate at the Ohio State Penitentiary, filed this *in forma pauperis* 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Defendants J. Pay and Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) Director Gary C. Mohr. Plaintiff alleges in the Complaint that ODRC adopted a new policy in 2012 that funds may be deposited in inmate accounts only by persons on an inmate's visitor list, and that the funds must be processed through J. Pay, a private company. He asserts in generalized fashion that this policy violates his rights under the First, Fifth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments, because: 1) persons who are approved to deposit funds must provide a copy of valid identification, thereby risking identity theft; 2) some persons and organizations are unable to be placed on inmate visitor lists; 3) the processing fee charge by J-Pay is an illegal "tax" on gifts and donations; and, 4) the policy imposes an undue hardship on Ohio prisoners.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364,

365 (1982) (per curiam), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact.<sup>1</sup> *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). The pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require “detailed factual allegations,” but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. *Id.* A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Id.* Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertion devoid of further factual enhancement. *Id.* It must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant's liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’ ” *Id.*

Applying the above standard, even construing the Complaint liberally in a light most favorable to the Plaintiff, *Brand v. Motley*, 526 F.3d 921, 924 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008), it does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting he might have a valid federal claim against these Defendants. *See, Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ.*, 76 F.3d 716 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996)(court not required to

---

<sup>1</sup> An *in forma pauperis* claim may be dismissed *sua sponte*, without prior notice to the plaintiff and without service of process on the defendant, if the court explicitly states that it is invoking section 1915(e) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)] and is dismissing the claim for one of the reasons set forth in the statute. *Chase Manhattan Mortg. Corp. v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 910, 915 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Gibson v. R.G. Smith Co.*, 915 F.2d 260, 261 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990); *Harris v. Johnson*, 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986).

accept summary allegations or unwarranted legal conclusions in determining whether complaint states a claim for relief). Accordingly, the request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted and this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). Further, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

*/s/John R. Adams*

---

JOHN R. ADAMS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 23, 2015